

## REMARKS

Applicants acknowledge the Office action mailed on November 16, 2004, and request re-examination of the above-mentioned application in view of the following remarks.

### Status of the Claims

Claims 1-54 were originally pending in the application, and claims 2, 6, 7, 10-17, 19-26, 31, 32, 39-44 and 48 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 9, 18, 27-30, 33-38, 45-47, 49 and 52-54 stand rejected by the Examiner. The Examiner has objected to claims 5, 50 and 51. The Examiner states claims 5, 50 and 51 contain allowable subject matter but depend from a rejected base claim.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 4, 8, 9, 18, 27-30, 33-38, 45-47, 49, and 52-54 stand rejected as obvious in view of the combination of U.S. Patent 5,791,715 to Nebel and U.S. Patent 6,227,607 to Dewald.

With this amendment, Applicants have amended claim 1 to incorporate the limitations recited in previously pending claim 5. Since the Examiner has described claim 5 as including allowable subject matter, Applicants believe claim 1, as amended, is allowable over the cited prior art.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejections of claims 27, 46 and 54 by the Examiner. Claim 27 claims, in part, "a means for ***drawing said expandable room to said side wall of the vehicle*** in order to increase the effectiveness of the seal" (emphasis added). Similarly, claim 46 claims, in part, "the movement of said expandable room into the retracted position ***causes said latch mechanism to assist said drive mechanism*** in withdrawing a portion of said expandable room" (emphasis added). Finally, claim 54 claims, in part, "the latching mechanism retaining the expandable room in the retracted position and


Appl. No. 09/977,721  
Amdt. Dated February 16, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of November 16, 2004

***withdrawing a portion of the expandable room into the retracted position as said expandable room moves in the direction of said side wall'*** (emphasis added). In rejecting these claims, the Examiner failed to explain which of the cited references teaches a latching mechanism capable of withdrawing the expandable room toward the vehicle. Moreover, upon review of the references, Applicants were unable to ascertain which cited reference teaches this limitation. Accordingly, Applicants believe the Examiner has failed to demonstrate that the combination of Nebel and Dewald render claims 27, 46 and 54 obvious. Consequently, Applicants believe these claims are in condition for allowance.

All pending dependent claims ultimately depend from one of independent claims 1, 27, 46, and 54. As all independent claims are allowable for the reasons set forth above, Applicants assert all pending dependent claims are also allowable.

Applicants believe the present application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request passage thereof. If necessary to effect a timely response, please consider this paper a request for an extension of time, and charge any shortages in fees, or apply any overpayment credits, to Baker & Daniels' Deposit Account No. 02-0387 (75327.63). However, please do not include the payment of issue fees.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Eric J. Groen, Reg. No. 32,230  
BAKER & DANIELS  
205 West Jefferson Boulevard, Suite 250  
South Bend, IN 46601  
Telephone: (574) 234-4149  
Fax: (574) 239-1900

Appl. No. 09/977,721

Amdt. Dated February 16, 2005

Reply to Office Action of November 16, 2004

I hereby certify that this  
correspondence is being deposited with the  
U.S. Postal Service as First Class Mail in an  
envelope addressed to: Commissioner for  
Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA  
22313-1450 on

  
Eric J. Groen, Reg. No. 32,230

February 16, 2005  
Date